List of Attending Members

Albanese-O'Neill,

Anastasia Southwest Airlines

Bates, Ron, Mayor, City of Los Alamitos

Barrie, Terry Caltrans

Bernson, Hal, Councilmember, City of Los Angeles
Bliss, Herman Federal Aviation Administration

Bow en, Thella San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (telephone)

Burkhart, Dan National Business Aviation Association

Butler, Viggo United Airports Limited

Davis, Bill Ventura County Transportation Commission

De La Loza, James Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Randy

Lamm as non-voting proxy)

Dixon, Richard, Mayor, City of Lake Forest

Galanter, Ruth Councilmember, City of Los Angeles

Gordon, Mike, Mayor, City of El Segundo

Griffith, Barry Palm Springs International Airport

Hammer, Russell Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce

Kunze, Chris Long Beach Airport

Kyser, Jack Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation (proxy)

Lloyd, Stephen Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Division (non-voting

proxy)

Mikels, Judy, Supervisor, County of Ventura (Chair)
Miscikow ski, Cindy, Councilmember, City of Los Angeles

Murphy, Alan, Director, John Wayne Airport
Nestande, Bruce, Los Angeles Business Advisors
O'Connor, Pam, Councilmember, City of Santa Monica

Ovitt, Gary, Mayor, City of Ontario

Perry, Bev City of Brea

Proo, Beatrice, Mayor, City of Pico Rivera
Ridgeway, Tod Mayor, City of New port Beach

Ritchie, Jim, Deputy Executive Director, Los Angeles World Airports

Rizzo, Philip, Executive Director, March Inland Port

Roberts, Ron Mayor, City of Temecula

Rodine, Robert, Valley Industry Commerce Association

Smith, Charles Supervisor, County of Orange

Smith, Scott, Ventura County Department of Airports

Soderquist, Peter, Airport Manager, Southern California Logistics Airport

Stanford, Dick, Mayor, City of Azusa

Stein, Ted Los Angeles City Airport Commission (vice chair)
Streator, Joyce Burbank Glendale Pasadena Airport Authority
Thomas, Sheryl Los Angeles World Airports, Government Affairs

List of Absent Members

Adams, Frank Federal Express

Antonovich, Mike Supervisor, County of Los Angeles

Bagley, Jim City of 29 Palms

Bishop, Richard Western Riverside Council of Governments (videoconference)

Cox, Richard Air Transport Association

Davis, Bill Ventura County Transportation Commission
De Young, Cathryn,
Dispenza, Mike Councilmember, City of Palmdale

Dispenza, Mike

Dunlap, Judy

Councilmember, City of Palmdale

Councilmember, City of Inglew ood

Los Angeles Air Cargo Association

Harrison, T. Milford

Knabe, Don

Supervisor, County of Los Angeles

Kuiper, Hank

Councilmember, City of Palmdale

Councilmember, City of Palmdale

Councilmember, City of Inglew ood

Los Angeles Air Cargo Association

San Bernardino International Airport

Supervisor, County of Imperial

MacRae, Bruce United Parcel Service

Mikels, Jon, Supervisor, County of San Bernardino (by telephone)

Murphy, Stacey, Councilmember, City of Burbank

Propst, Rod, Chair, Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

Russell, Jon Airline Pilots Association Schatz, Carol Central City Association

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The November 21, 2002 meeting of the Aviation Task Force was called to order at 10:02 a.m. by Chairperson Judy Mikels, Supervisor, Ventura County.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Ms. Patricia Hamilton requested that the minutes be corrected. On the last paragraph of page seven, Public Speaker Carol Hossan is noted as from the City of Westchester. Westchester is not a city but a section of Los Angeles.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she had been involved in the [LAX] Master Plan for seven years, in opposition to enlarging LAX. The speaker noted 1) LAX does need upgrading, but not with any more intrusion into the business and residential properties in the surrounding established communities, 2) The Master Plan would be inadequate upon completion for the projected air traffic and aircraft size that will be in operation in a few years, and 3) LAX should grow regionally. The speaker agrees with Hal Bernson and his remarks at last month's meeting, that whatever route in the planning transportation project is selected, it must be something that will enhance areas that are building. The speaker noted that If the system is going to work, it must be part of a comprehensive transportation plan, and an aviation plan as well. Commerce is extremely important to the vitality of southern California. The speaker asserted that If more airports throughout the region are not in place, the projected air traffic, with the associated air commerce that they bring, will be landing in Arizona and Nevada, and they already have plans in place.

3.0 ROUTINE ITEMS

3.1 October 17 Meeting Minutes

Chair Mikels noted the one correction to the minutes noted by the public speaker and asked if there were any other corrections. Noting no other corrections, Seeing none, the minutes will stand as corrected.

3.2 Members Phone List

Chair Mikels requested all participants to review the membership listing and notify SCAG staff of any discrepancies in contact information.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

There were no Information Items.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

5.1 <u>Variation Assumptions</u>

Mr. Michael Armstrong, SCAG Staff, presented two plan variations that staff is recommending for modeling and analysis for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and for the airspace analysis. Both variations are consistent with directions from the task force to not "reinvent the wheel." Both are based on the fundamental characteristics of the 2001 adopted plan, with the exception that they do not include El Toro. These variations provide modest differences so that a range of assumptions can be tested by the regional aviation study and the airspace analysis.

In the agenda packet, there is an attachment for the demand model definitions and assumptions that were used for the 2001 RTP. These assumptions covered such inputs as aircraft load factors, seating capacities, airport hours of operation and passenger sensitivities to airport and ground access characteristics. It is important to point out that all these variables are all being updated and refined for the upcoming analysis. We anticipate that these updated variables will be available to present to the task force, sometime early in 2003, after they have been reviewed by the Aviation Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC).

Before the modeling takes place, a comprehensive airport capacity analysis will take place, focusing particular attention on LAX, Ontario, Burbank and John Wayne airports. The analysis is hoped to identify the ultimate capacity-limiting factor for each airport, such as gates, runways, etc. Airports must be looked at like a pipe with multiple spigots; the spigot that closes the pipe completely is the capacity limiting factor. We intend to look at the entire airport system to identify the ultimate limiting factor at a particular airport.

For the first time, catalytic demand will be used in the modeling process. Catalytic demand is the additional demand that is induced around airports by the growth that is generated by the growth and development that are attracted to new or expanded airports with developable land around them. Catalytic demand is anticipated to boost the demand around suburban airports within the Inland Empire and Palmdale, and support the regional decentralization strategy.

The modeling for each variation will not only allocate demand to airports but will also identify the demand generated by each county and each Regional Airport Demand Allocation Model (RADAM) zone. There are 100 RADAM zones and each county is made up of a number of RADAM zones. The modeling will also show the demand percentages generated by each county to each airport. This information will check the consistency of demand served with fair share objectives.

The first plan variation is the constrained variation. It will serve as a constrained aviation alternative for the 2004 RTP Environmental Impact Report (EIR). It is very similar to Scenario 6, which was used as the constrained scenario in the 2001 RTP EIR. Like Scenario 6 it would assume existing physical and legal constraints at regional airports, with the exception that John Wayne Airport would be revised to reflect adjustments and time extensions to the settlement agreement. Economically, this scenario will be even more conservative than Scenario 6, in that it will be assumed that the current financial plight of airlines will have repercussions long into the future, and will impact their ability to invest in service at suburban airports. Therefore, there could be reduced service at these facilities. There would also be no regional MagLev or state high-speed-rail system assumed.

The second variation, the Moderate Expansion Variation, leaves suburban Inland Empire airports and Palmdale airport unconstrained. There would be a full range of market incentives applied. There would also be some modest expansion of existing urban airports, with the exception of LAX, which would be held to its existing physical capacity of 78 million annual passengers (MAP). The capacity analysis would assess the proposed master plan improvements (Mayor Hahn Alternative). The analysis will examine what constraints could be used (if necessary) to physically keep the airport at 78 MAP within the alternative.

The capacity analysis at Ontario International Airport would examine impacts of a potential third runway, as well as the feasibility of a third runway. Both the LAX and Ontario capacity analyses will be closely coordinated with LAWA.

For John Wayne and Long Beach airports, staff is proposing how modest expansion could occur without significantly impacting operations such as new remote aircraft parking positions accessed by passenger shuttles. For John Wayne Airport, it assumes the existing settlement agreement that extends a policy cap at that airport would not be renewed.

For Burbank Airport SCAG would determine whether the new security requirements that could possibly inhibit the throughput of passengers. The processing of passengers through the existing terminal could be hindered to such an extent that it wouldn't be realistic to add new remote parking positions because of the difficulty of just processing passengers through the terminal. Because of this, it may not make sense to add new gate positions at that airport.

For Long Beach Airport, SCAG is adjusting its capacity assessment from 3.0 MAP to 3.8 MAP to assume a more liberal passenger assessment within a 41-flights/day schedule at the airport. Higher load factors and larger aircraft would be assumed.

Lastly, the Moderate Expansion Variation would assume both the inter-regional MagLev system and would also assume the state High-Speed-Rail system. In this variation some of the short haul air travel demand would be served by the state system. This variation would also be run with and without the regional MagLev system for comparative purposes.

Mr. Armstrong noted to the task force that staff went over the plan variations with the Aviation Technical Advisory Committee, which did endorse the variations with some refinements, which were discussed today.

Hon. Mike Gordon, Mayor, El Segundo, wanted to clarify that all the assumptions would be updated to reflect the current time. Mr. Armstrong stated that it was correct. Mayor Gordon had some recommendations. One is that through the modeling, that SCAG look at what San Diego County is doing with respect to their airport in order to assess the distribution of SCAG airport demand within San Diego county, particularly north San Diego County. Second, that the Airbus 380 be examined for its potential at Ontario Airport and what that would mean for the region, particularly in terms of air cargo and in air passengers in conjunction with MagLev as well as the California-Nevada MagLev line that is being discussed. Air Cargo could benefit from the A-380 at March and San Bernardino International airports.

Mr. Alan Murphy, John Wayne Airport, wanted to comment on the John Wayne assumptions. The settlement agreement is set to expire in 2005 and is being renegotiated. The process is expected to be completed very quickly. The question is that if the process is complete prior to modeling, will the model incorporate the restrictions? Mr. Armstrong stated that if it were a legally enforceable agreement, SCAG would abide by it. Mr. Murphy also noted that shuttling passengers to remote aircraft parking is specifically precluded in the federal court stipulation and the new amendment also has that language in it. If it is finalized in time, it should also be taken out of the modeling.

Mr. Hasan Ikhrata, SCAG Staff, stated to the task force that SCAG currently does not have San Diego in the model, so extra things have to be done to account for San Diego demand, and this must be balanced within the available budget. Mr. Ikhrata agreed with Mayor Gordon that it needs to be considered, but questioned the ability of SCAG to model San Diego demand. SCAG may use "off-model" methodologies to examine San Diego.

Rich Macias, SCAG staff, indicated that staff could explore with SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments) to see if SANDAG has conducted demand allocation and if so, how much has been allocated to SCAG regional airports.

Hon. Ruth Galanter, Councilmember, City of Los Angeles, noted that Southwest Airlines, from an earlier meeting, had once discussed how they move into an airport, and that is when that airport is closest for three million people. Given the fact the population is shifting and growing, there are some airports that, today, may not be nearest for three million people, but might be in the near future. So as catalytic demand is factored in, can it take the demographic data and figure out when an airport will be the closest airport for three million people?

Mr. Armstrong explained that the model examines attractions of companies that rely on proximity to airports for their businesses, and by virtue of airports attracting economic activity, then airport demand would increase.

Councilmember Galanter agreed, but stated the same thing occurs, or an analogous process occurs, when nearby populations reach a threshold. Using Palmdale as an example, which one day will be the nearest airport for three million people. An airline that looks to serve a market will be one of the companies that would be attracted.

Dr. Andrew McKenzie, CitiGroup Technologies, stated that the catalytic models within the demand model do examine some concept of airline thinking. However, the model does not examine a three million threshold, but examines the propensities to fly within the population, and how airlines might react to the potential opportunities. So the answer to the question is yes, but in a more refined manner than just population.

Councilmember Galanter then asked if the Burbank Terminal decision would impact the model assumptions, and will it be factored in.

Mr. Armstrong explained that it would have little impact. In its previous capacity analysis, SCAG had determined the limiting factor for capacity at Burbank is the gate capacity. Terminal throughput is close behind. The gates are limited by the number of aircraft that can be parked close to the terminal. One possible solution that is being proposed is to park the aircraft remotely and shuttle people to them.

Ms. Anastasia Albanese-O'Neill, Southwest Airlines wanted to clarify the three million passenger figure. The three million is the number used when entering a new market that is not already being served by Southwest. Metropolitan regions with multiple airports, such as Los Angeles and the Bay Area are unique markets and calculations will be different.

Mr. Armstrong stated the model examines the "Southwest Effect," where the influx of inexpensive air service increases propensities to fly in nearby populations.

Hon. Ron Bates, Mayor, City of Los Alamitos, asked if the model was built on census tracts.

Dr. McKenzie explained the model is built on transportation analysis zones that correspond with census tracts. However, because there are over 3,200 of them, modeling results are more presentable using the RADAM zones.

Mayor Bates asked if the RADAM zones had similar demographics within them.

Dr. McKenzie stated that to some extent yes, There is also some historical data and surveys that go back over 15 years, which utilized those zones.

Mayor Bates mentioned an earlier comment he considered very important concerning potential economic loss to southern California if the region does not meet the air demand. How is the model, and how is the work SCAG is doing, going to quantify that issue and discussion, so that the task force can use that information in any policy determinations that it might make.

Dr. McKenzie explained that the model would assign passengers to other regions if this region cannot accommodate them. When that happens, the model can quantify what passengers will be lost, the economic value that would be lost and what type of employment would be generated in the other regions.

Mr. Armstrong added that SCAG could run an unconstrained alternative with the new data to examine not only passengers lost to other regions, but passengers who would simply not fly.

Hon. Gary Ovitt, Mayor, City of Ontario, thanked staff for the report and concurred with Mayor Gordon concerning the A-380 at Ontario. In terms of a third runway at Ontario, Mayor Ovitt questioned the ability of the airport to build a third runway within the existing property boundaries and would require additional property purchases. Input from LAWA would be necessary, not only on the ability of the airport to handle the A-380, but also the third runway.

Mr. Bruce Nestande, Los Angeles Business Advisors, asked if the catalytic demand would be modeled for all six airports in existence.

Mr. Armstrong stated that it would. However, catalytic demand is based on developable land that can accommodate it. Airports in built-out urban environments with little room to expand will have greater difficulty in generating catalytic demand.

Mr. Chris Kunze, Long Beach Airport questioned the 78 MAP number for LAX and the airspace and stated that a higher number should be examined in the airspace analysis to test airspace impacts at a large LAX.

Mr. Armstrong stated that both variations will be used for the airspace analysis. Originally, staff was also considering a high range alternative for a greater range but the additional work was beyond the limited budget.

Chair Mikels noted that there not being any more questions, stated the action before the task force is to approve the two variations. The action was moved and seconded.

Chair Mikels asked if there were any questions. An unidentified task force member asked if Palm Springs and Point Mugu would be included. Mr. Armstrong stated that Palm Springs would be included, but Point Mugu would not be. Chair Mikels noted that the Navy is no longer offering Point Mugu for joint-use activity.

Chair Mikels noted there being no opposition, the motion carries. Chair Mikels requested that any task force member that has questions concerning the model, the variations or the assumptions, to contact staff, rather than raise questions once the process is complete.

5.2 Ground Access Work Plan

Mr. Hasan Ikhrata, SCAG staff, stated that another important component is ground access. As SCAG moves with the variations, it is required to identify a boundary around each airport and analyze the study areas. The task force will recommend to the Regional Council an aviation scenario. That scenario will be in five year increments (2005, 2010, etc). This is important, because as the airports are planned, how air travelers and air cargo gets to and from airport becomes critical. This is important not just for the airport itself, but for the (regional) plan in general.

For the baseline for future years, it will be assumed that the RTP constrained projects will be in place. Everything that has committed funding will be assumed to be there. In addition, specific projects will be proposed to deal with the ground access issues by all modes. System deficiencies will be identified and improvements will be proposed. Some ground access projects are in the RTP, but not all are funded. These projects will be evaluated along with potential new projects and will be part of the aviation scenario analysis.

Cost is a concern, as well as funding sources. How to integrate these improvements into the ground access components of airport master plans also needs to be examined. Implementation strategies will need to be identified within the five-year increments. These strategies will need to be consistent with the RTP, conform to the clean air act, be financially constrained, etc.

It is important to have this "Ground Access" Plan submitted to the TCC and Regional Council by summer 2003 in order for them to act on it prior to release of the RTP Update.

Mr. Ikhrata requested to move on to the next item, ground access planning teams, as it is integral to developing a ground access work plan. Chair Mikels concurred.

5.3 Ground Access Planning Teams

SCAG is requesting the Aviation Task Force allow it to set up ground access planning teams. SCAG is requesting to set up groups of airports. Although the planning isn't finalized, it is envisioned there will be three teams, 1) LAX and Inland Empire, 2) LAX, Long Beach and John Wayne and 3) LAX and North LA County. Each team will examine their ground access needs. County transportation commissions city leaders and airports will make up each team.

MagLev will be considered a significant project to be reviewed by each team.

Ground access projects should be integrated within airport master plans, be financially constrained and part of a conforming plan. They should be acceptable

to the state and federal agencies that would be required to approve the RTP. SCAG is therefore asking the task force to authorize staff to create these project teams.

Hon. Ron Bates, Mayor, City of Los Alamitos, asked if SCAG has figured out how to work in, or give extra credit to, aviation related ground access projects in the RTP. The reason being is that when transportation agencies examine SCAG projects, they may not necessarily give as high a priority as they should. How can SCAG, in its performance evaluation, make sure these items get appropriate rating based on the impact they deserve in relieving regional congestion?

Mr. Ikhrata stated that every project that is proposed to be part of the RTP would go through the performance evaluation. Ground access projects will be done the same way.

The second component of the question is the financial ability to support the project, or the county transportation commissions have not included it in their priorities. That could take some work. In addition, any project included in the RTP must conform to the clean air act requirements, and any project that is not in the RTP cannot be implemented if it were to use federal funds.

A Task Force member asked how much SCAG would study remote check-in facilities. Mr. Ikhrata stated that SCAG would be examining remote check-in facilities, but cautioned members that SCAG has a very limited budget for examining potential projects, but would do the best it could within the limited time and budget. How ever, it cannot afford to reinvent the wheel in terms of modeling. There will be some remote check-in analysis, but it will not be substantial.

Hon. Charles Smith, Supervisor, Orange County, asked if SCAG would be examining the ground access improvements for both variants that would be modeled. Mr. Ikhrata replied that SCAG would be doing that.

Chair Mikels asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, Chair Mikels stated that it was critical that the task force was finally discussing coordinating the master plans of the regional airports with the regional aviation plan, because otherwise, the plan would be nothing more than ink on paper. Also important is working with local governments to help ensure an understanding that the regional aviation plan is pivotal on receiving ground access coordination.

Mr. Ikhrata wanted to add to a point made earlier concerning economic benefits. The task force needs to resolve all issues with assumptions and modeling immediately, because based on the assumptions and the model, SCAG will perform an economic benefit analysis, so if there are any questions concerning

modeling, let SCAG staff know. Once modeling starts SCAG can't go back and change the input assumptions to the model w ithout restarting the model.

Mr. Rich Macias, SCAG Staff, stated that since the task force approved the variations to be modeled at this meeting, the modeling could start. Staff can provide some preliminary results probably after several months.

Chair Mikels stated she would remind the elected officials on the Regional Council that, now that the task force has made a decision, they have to refrain from contacting staff and asking staff to evaluate additional variations. There is not an infinite amount of money attached to the project. Every time there is a start-stop-add something-restart, it costs additional money. Therefore the chair is implementing the same rule from the last Aviation Task Force. Nothing will be changed, no assumptions will be considered by staff without approval by the Aviation Task Force and a financial statement attached to them. By that, what is the impact on the progress and the cost of the project? If the rule is not follow ed, it slows down the project, increases the costs and impacts the consensus of the task force.

Ms. Anastasia Albanese-O'Neill, Southwest Airlines wanted to comment today, because of the Chair's statement, on the load factors assumed. Given the stated of the industry, the load factors, at least in the short term, are higher than the assumptions provided.

Dr. Andrew McKenzie, CitiGroup Technologies, stated the assumptions provided to the task force were default values from an earlier analysis. Load factors that will be used for the new analysis will be based on aircraft type, seating configurations for each airline.

Ms. Albanese-O'Neill stated that some airlines could require a significant load factor of 80- 90%, to survive. Will the load factors be re-assessed prior to modeling, given the industry condition? Dr. McKenzie stated they would be reassessed to reflect current conditions and after discussion with the various air service providers. The load factors provided as an example to the task force were from 1998.

Chair Mikels wanted to express her appreciation to Ms. Albanese-O'Neill and air industry representatives on the task force for bringing information to the task force prior to spending money towards a decision.

Mr. Ikhrata mentioned that SCAG had previously sponsored a workshop on the demand model. Mr. Ikhrata stated he would like to have another workshop strictly to deal with these assumptions prior to modeling.

Hon. Tod Ridgeway, Mayor, City of Newport Beach, noted that for any capital project, and this will be a capital project, it can only be as good as the underlying assumptions. Mayor Ridgeway wanted to question Mr. Macias, SCAG Staff, concerning remote aircraft parking at John Wayne airport, and Mr. Murphy's admonition regarding the settlement agreement prohibiting that practice. Mayor Ridgeway hoped that prohibition would be incorporated into the model.

Mr. Macias stated that none of this would be done in a vacuum. Staff is in constant contact with the airports and with the Aviation Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC). This issue was brought up the last ATAC meeting. Any conflicts will be resolved prior to modeling.

Mr. Dan Burkhart, National Business Aviation Association, asked if general aviation was part of the demand model, and if not, how can SCAG measure the loss to the economy for general aviation in the constrained variation.

Dr. McKenzie stated that general aviation is included in the RADAM model but in a general way. One example is that it doesn't distinguish between type of aircraft, such as a Piper Cub versus a Cessna 172. It looks at general aviation as one type of aircraft that has a certain airspace requirement, landing requirement and facility requirement. It is included for inputs into the airspace analysis, as a general aviation aircraft cannot follow as close behind a commercial jet as another commercial jet due to wake vortex.

Mr. Burkhart noted there are some general aviation jet aircraft that can mix with commercial aviation from an airspace perspective. So the question starts to revolve around real estate at airports and the ability to have access to those airports. That restriction forces businesses to move elsewhere or locate somewhere other than this region.

Mr. Ikhrata stated that at the conclusion of the last task force, An aviation economic impact analysis was completed that looked at all airports. SCAG will start with that study and take into account the economic impacts to the region.

Chair Mikels noted that the National Association of Regional Councils is undertaking an initiative on general aviation, examining three factors: 1) sport 2) business and 3) emergency services and access.

Hon. Ron Roberts, Mayor, City of Temecula wanted to ensure that March Inland Port be included in the ground access planning teams. He noted that the facility was not included in the original memo. Mr. Ikhrata stated that March would be included.

Mr. Robert Rodine, Valley Industry and Commerce Association, expressed his concern about general aviation. What is not mentioned in the airspace assumptions are the real estate issues. In the master planning process at LAX, the airport went through an excruciating process to find land to accommodate general aviation. The problem with general aviation is that it does take up some real estate. Where in the assumptions is that accommodated?

Mr. Ikhrata stated that general aviation is part of the demand model and is part of the discussion that will occur. The economic benefit of analysis will be significant, especially after 2010. The regional economy is growing between one and two percent per year, in terms of employment. After 2010, employment will grow at only a fraction of one percent because of baby boomer retirements and other labor issues. Any job loss to the region after 2010 will be more significant than ever. Whether it is general aviation or commercial aviation is important.

Mr. Armstrong, SCAG, stated that under the Moderate Expansion Variant, there would be moderate expansion of urban airports and would not involve disruption of any existing operations, including general aviation.

Chair Mikels noted that the recommended action is to endorse the ground access work plan and allow staff to establish ground access planning teams. Are there any questions? Seeing none, Chair Mikels asked if there was a motion. There was a motion to approve, which was seconded. Chair Mikels asked if there were any opposition. Seeing none, Chair Mikels stated that would be the action.

Chair Mikels noted that in January, Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) will be presenting. Are there any new items? Mr. Macias, SCAG, noted that LAWA would have the entire meeting to speak on the LAX Master Plan, the Ontario Master Plan and the Palmdale Master Plan.

6.0 SET NEXT MEETING DATE/TIME/PLACE

Chair Judy Mikels stated that December is a difficult month for meetings, and noting a recommendation from staff not to meet in December. There was a motion and second to have no December meeting. Seeing no opposition the December meeting was cancelled. The next meeting will be held on January 16 at the SCAG offices at 10:00 a.m.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Judy Mikels adjourned the meeting at 11:17 am.